REMARKS

The present application was filed on May 24, 2001 with claims 1 through 32. Claims 1 through 32 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-12, 15, 16, 18-22, 24, 25, and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al. (United States Patent Number 5,680,511), and rejected claims 3, 7-9, 14, 17, 23, 26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. in view of Mitchell et al. (United States Patent Number 5,799,273). The Examiner indicated that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24 and 28

Independent claim 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al. Regarding claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28, the Examiner asserts that Baker teaches "processing….salient terms" as picking out unrecognized words (col. 9, lines 4-9); and "displaying the text….terms" as displaying the choice words to be analyzed (col. 10, lines 27-30).

Applicants note that the Examiner is equating the determination of salient terms with "picking out unrecognized words." In the Examiner's first citation, Baker teaches:

> The illustrated system 10 operates on words stored in the data string memory 12 which includes one or more context words 36 and at least one unrecognized, or ambiguous, word 38 which is currently being recognized by the system 10. The data string in the memory element 12 can represent the current passage of words being recognized by the system 10.
> Col. 9, lines 4-9.

The present disclosure, however, teaches that "salient terms are those terms *that meet a predetermined level of selectivity* in a collection." (Page 4, lines 8-9; emphasis added.) Unrecognized, or ambiguous, words are *not* salient terms. Independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28 require processing the text to determine *salient terms*; and displaying the text by emphasizing the *salient terms* and minimizing *non-salient* terms.

In the Examiner's second citation, Baker teaches:

> The monitor 44 displays information to the system user. The information can include a visual representation of the words being analyzed as well as the list of choice words 20A-20E being analyzed by the system 10.
> Col. 10, lines 27-30.

While Baker does suggest presenting a list of choice words, Baker does not suggest displaying the text by *emphasizing the salient terms* and *minimizing non-salient terms*.

Thus, Baker et al. do not disclose or suggest processing the text to determine salient terms; and displaying the text by emphasizing the salient terms and minimizing non-salient terms, as required by independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28.

Additional Cited References

Mitchell et al. was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of highlighting the word, replacing the word, inserting the tag, and playback of the audio. Applicants note that Mitchell is directed to a data processing apparatus for receiving recognition data from a speech recognition engine and its corresponding dictated audio data where the recognition data includes recognised words or characters. A display displays the recognised words or characters and the recognised words or characters are stored as a file together with the corresponding audio data. Mitchell, however, does not address the issue of processing text to determine salient terms; and displaying the text by emphasizing the salient terms and minimizing non-salient terms.

Thus, Mitchell et al. do not disclose or suggest processing the text to determine salient terms; and displaying the text by emphasizing the salient terms and minimizing non-salient terms, as required by independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-32

Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 20-22, 25, 27, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al., and claims 3, 7-9, 14, 17, 23, 26, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. in view of Mitchell et al.

Claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-32 are dependent on claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Baker et al. and Mitchell et al. (alone or in combination) because of their dependency

from independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-32, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

5   If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

10   Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2005   Kevin M. Mason
                                                    Attorney for Applicants
15   Reg. No. 36,597
                                                    Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
                                                    1300 Post Road, Suite 205
                                                    Fairfield, CT 06824
                                                    (203) 255-6560